



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,109	02/25/2004	Masaaki Goto	16991.017	1642
28381 7590 04/30/2007 ARNOLD & PORTER LLP ATTN: IP DOCKETING DEPT. 555 TWELFTH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20004-1206			EXAMINER PAK, MICHAEL D	
			ART UNIT 1646	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/30/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/785,109	Applicant(s) GOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Pak	Art Unit 1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 32-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 32-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Amendment filed September 6, 2006 has been entered.
2. Applicant's arguments filed September 6, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive.
3. Claims 1-31 have been canceled and claims 32-35 have been added.
4. The finality of the rejection of the last Office action is withdrawn in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1646

5. Claims 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Second, the claims recite "OCIF protein", which is indefinite. There is no structure associated with this term and there is no art accepted meaning of this term at the time the instant invention was filed. Therefore, the metes and bounds of what is to be encompassed by this term are unclear and the claims are indefinite.

Applicants argue that one skilled in the art would understand that the OCIF protein refers to a "...compound that is produced by human lung fibroblast cells and inhibits osteoclast differentiation and/or maturation having a molecular weight of about 60 kD and about 120 kD under non-reducing conditions and about 60 kD under reducing conditions on SDS-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis. However, terms are relative and can change from scientific paper to another. Furthermore, the term does not define the specific structure of the amino acid sequence.

6. Claims 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

Claims encompass a polypeptide variants of SEQ ID NO:5 without structural limitations because of the recitation of the polypeptide by name only. However, the

Art Unit: 1646

essential feature of the invention is not clear because the polypeptide SEQ ID NO:5 structure is not provided, and one of skilled in the art cannot envision the full genus of molecules of the claimed polypeptide molecules. The claims encompass variants whose structure is not known or other variant proteins with different function from SEQ ID NO:5 taught in the specification. Claimed protein variants encompass a large genus of proteins which are alleles or variants whose function has yet to be identified from different species of animal because the structure of the newly identified naturally occurring protein is not known. *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. (CAFC) 43 USPQ2d 1398* held that a generic claim to human or mammalian when only the rat protein sequence was disclosed did not have written description in the specification.

It is suggested that percent identity language with functional language be used in the claim limitation drawn to SEQ ID NO:5 if supported by the specification.

7. Claims 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an osteoclastogenesis inhibitory factor protein comprising an amino acid sequence SEQ ID NO:5, does not reasonably provide enablement for an osteoclastogenesis inhibitory factor protein is limited by name only. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The first paragraph of § 112 requires that the patent specification enable "those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without

undue experimentation." Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk AIS, 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (quoting In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)); see also In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). ("[T]he scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art."). Whether making and using the invention would have required undue experimentation, and thus whether the disclosure is enabling is a legal conclusion based upon several underlying factual inquiries. See In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 735, 736-37, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1402, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As set forth in Wands, the factors to be considered in determining whether a claimed invention is enabled throughout its scope without undue experimentation include the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in the art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and the breadth of the claims.

Likewise, in Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co., 927 F.2d 1200, 18 USPQ2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991), the court affirmed the holding of invalidity of claims to analogs of the EPO gene under § 112 for lack of enablement where applicants had claimed every possible analog of the EPO gene but had disclosed only how to make EPO and a very few analogs. "[D]espite extensive statements in the specification concerning all analogs of the EPO gene that can be made, there is little enabling disclosure of the particular analogs and how to make them There may be many other

genetic sequences that code for EPO-type products. Amgen has told how to make and use only a few of them and is therefore not entitled to claim all of them." *Id.*, 927 F.2d at 1213-14, 18 USPQ2d at 1027.

Claims encompass variants with unlimited changes to SEQ ID NO:5 because of the claim to protein limited by name only. However, one skilled in the art cannot make and to use variants of SEQ ID NO:5. The state of the art is such that one skilled in the art prior to the time of the invention did not know how to create unlimited number of variants of SEQ ID NO:5 which are functional. The amount of direction provided in the specification is limited to a specific species of SEQ ID NO:5. One skilled in the art would require empirical experimentation in order to determine the changes to SEQ ID NO:5 sequence without disrupting the structure of the receptor activity. However, the specification does not teach how to use variants of SEQ ID NO:5 which are functional. Proteins have active sites which are essential for the proper function of the protein in its interaction with the polynucleotide or polypeptide domains (McKenna et al., *Endocrine Review* 1999). A fragment of the binding protein which is truncated in the middle of the various domains or a fragment which does not allow the proper folding of the domain or is deleted would not be expected to function. The state of the art is such that one skilled in the art cannot predict the outcome of changes to protein structure using the primary amino acid structure as the predictor (Bowie et al., *Science*, 1989). Thus, one skilled in the art cannot use the primary amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:5 polypeptide alone to predict the tertiary structure of SEQ ID NO:1 polypeptide which would be required to determine the protein function and proper folding of SEQ ID NO:5

Art Unit: 1646

polypeptide. No working example is provided to determine whether a change in the domains of SEQ ID NO:5 polypeptide variant would provide proper function. It would require empirical experimentation to determine whether the variants of SEQ ID NO:5 is functional. Thus, variants encompass a genus with a large number of species which are not functional. In view of the extent and the unpredictability of the experimentation required to practice the invention as claimed, one skilled in the art could not make the invention without undue experimentation. Therefore, based on the above Wands analysis, a preponderance of the evidence supports a conclusion that one skilled in the art would not have been enabled to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Art Unit: 1646

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 32-35 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable claims 1-2 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,855,808. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,855,808 anticipates the claims 32-35 of the present application. The polypeptide of claims 1-2 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,855,808 inherently has the functional claim limitation. Applicants argue that there is an embodiment of the invention that falls within the scope of one claim but not the other. Since the claims are anticipated by one species over the generic claim, both sets of claims are encompassed within the genus.

9. Claims 32-35 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable claims 1-14 of prior U.S. Patent No. 7,125,686. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 7,125,686 comprises the same protein as the polypeptide of claims 32-35 of the present application. The polypeptide of claims 1-14 of prior U.S. Patent No. 7,125,686 inherently has the same function. Applicants argue that there is an embodiment of the invention that falls within the scope of one claim but

Art Unit: 1646

not the other. Since the claims are anticipated by one species over the generic claim, both sets of claims are encompassed within the genus.

10. No claim is allowed.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pak whose telephone number is 571-272-0879. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Nickol can be reached on 571-272-0835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael D. Pak
Michael Pak
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1646
April 20, 2006